

SECTION M Evaluation Factors for Award

M-1 Evaluation Summary.

M-1.1 Basis for Contract Award. Under this RFP, DARPA reserves the right to fund none, one, or up to two (2) contract awards. In the event that one or two contract awards are made, DARPA anticipates that funding will be provided initially for Base (Phase I) effort only. Following the Base (Phase I) effort, DARPA reserves the right to exercise the Option 1 (Phase II) effort for each awardee, one awardee, or none of the awardees. It is further anticipated that following the Option 1 (Phase II) effort, DARPA will exercise the Option 2 (Phase III) effort for only one contract awardee. DARPA reserves the right, however, to exercise the Option 2 (Phase III) effort for each awardee, one awardee, or none of the awardees. If an award, or awards, is/are made under this RFP, any such award will be made on the basis of competitive source selection (FAR Subpart 15.3), and using "Best Value" criteria per FAR 15.101. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror;

- Whose proposal is technically acceptable;
- Whose offer is deemed responsive to the solicitation requirements;
- Whose price is deemed fair and reasonable;
- Whose overall offer represents the "Best Value" to the Government, proposed cost and other factors considered, consistent and compliant, with the Evaluation Factors specified for this solicitation

M-1.2 Evaluation Criteria Summary. The government will evaluate acceptable proposals based on the six criterion identified herein. The evaluation will weight each of the six criterion areas as follows: Criterion 1, 2, 3, and 4 are of equal weight, and are each worth 22% of the total score. Criterion 5, & 6 are of significantly lower weight than Criterion 1, 2, 3, and 4. Criterion 5 is worth 9% of the total score, and Criterion 6 is worth 3% of the total score. Successful proposals should incorporate a balanced approach that responds to all six of the aforementioned selection criteria. Each of the six criteria will be rated based on numerical scores from 0 to 100. The overall weighted score, as discussed above, will be assigned to offerors proposals based on the Government's assessment of the offerors proposal. The two highest scoring proposals, compliant with the terms and conditions specified for this RFP, and evaluated in accordance with the six criteria noted herein, are anticipated to result in contract award.

M-1.3 MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE CRITERIA. In order to be considered for proposal evaluation and subsequent award, the offerors proposal must meet the following minimum promulgated requirements. Any proposal failing to meet the minimum promulgated requirements as specified below, will automatically be considered unacceptable and such proposal will be removed from further consideration and/or evaluation. The minimum acceptable requirements for this RFP are as follows:

Minimum Requirements

- Accuracy of 4m CEP within a +/- steering range of 100 m from its nominal ballistic trajectory. Technical justification for CEP estimates must be included in the proposal.
- Contact fuze detonator is required.
- Alterations to fuze/guidance package only; designs altering base mortar components are unacceptable.
- Production cost of fuze package replacement shall not exceed \$500 (GFY04\$).
- Program cost NTE \$10,000,000 (GFY04\$). [NOTE: The Government Program cost NTE \$10,000,000 does not include CLIN 0004. The Government Program cost NTE \$10,000,000 includes CLIN 0001, 0002, 0003, and 0005 ONLY.]
- Daytime operational capability for arctic (high reflectance white), grassland (moderate reflectance green), desert (moderate reflectance brown), and urban (variegated) warfare environment.
- Interoperability with nighttime designation capabilities that are currently fielded
- Program schedule NTE 30 months.
- An anti-tamper device that ensures the classified elements of the fuze guidance package are not accessible in the field and are irretrievable from an expended round, including a dud round.

NOTE: ANY PROPOSAL IN WHICH ANY OF THE CRITERION SPECIFIED HEREIN ARE RATED “UNACCEPTABLE” BY THE GOVERNMENT WILL RESULT IN THE TOTAL PROPOSAL BEING FOUND “UNACCEPTABLE.”

M-2 General Procedures.

For an offer to be acceptable for award, the Offeror must agree to the terms and conditions specified in Sections A through K of this solicitation, agree to the associated solicitation provisions and/or resulting contract clauses, and agree to the final negotiated Contractor Statement of Work (SOW) and supporting documents which form the scope of performance. The Offeror must also completely and thoroughly review this RFP in its entirety, fill in the values associated with contract line item numbers (CLINs) 0001, 0002, 0003, and 0004 listed in Section B, with the values of CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 not-to-exceed \$10,000,000. The offeror must also complete all required Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors listed in Section K, follow the specific instructions listed in Section L, fill in any and all other necessary areas of the solicitation, comply with the attachments to the RFP, and otherwise comply with all requirements delineated for this solicitation.

M-3 Evaluation Criteria.

Criterion 1: Technical realism and viability/Realistic and Supported Performance Metrics

The offering must be both technically achievable and viable, within the scope (cost and schedule) of this program. Criterion 1 consists of Criterion 1A, Criterion 1B and Criterion 1C as described below. The maximum number of points for this criterion is 100 points.

Criterion 1A. Realistic and Supported Performance Metrics

Contractors must provide a justified estimate of a realistic CEP for Static $\Delta r=100\text{m}$ for each of the short, medium, and long ranges as shown in the table below. (Δr is defined as the radial change in impact position from its nominal ballistic trajectory).

Baseline Performance:

Static Designated Target Maximum Steering Radius 100 m		
	Day CEP	Night CEP
Short Range (1.2 km)		
Medium Range (2.2 km)		
Long Range (3.2 km)		

Points will be assigned to each element in the above table on the basis of the indicated CEP of the proposed solution, supported with calculation, analysis and data, and verified by Government Evaluators as supportable, as follows:

Point Table for Baseline, Static Designated Target Maximum Steering Radius 100 m	
CEP	Points
≤ 4 meters	3
≤ 3 meters	6
≤ 2 meters	9

Extended Performance:

Contractors may additionally perform calculations of CEP for a static designated target for a maximum steering radius of 200m, and/or CEP for a designated target moving at 30 kph, for each of the medium and long range cases shown below. These extended capabilities are not mandatory; however proposals addressing these metrics, supported with calculations, analysis, and data, and verified by Government Evaluators as supportable, may be awarded additional points, as specified herein.

Static Designated Target Maximum Steering Radius 200 m		
	Day CEP	Night CEP
Medium Range (2.2 km)		
Long Range (3.2 km)		

Designated Target Moving at 30 kph		
	Day CEP	Night CEP
Medium Range (2.2 km)		
Long Range (3.2 km)		

Points will be assigned to each element in the above two tables on the basis of the indicated CEP of the proposed solution, supported with calculation, analysis and data, and verified by Government Evaluators as supportable, as follows:

Point Table for Extended Performance Static Designated Target Maximum Steering Radius 200 m Or Designated Target Moving at 30 kph	
CEP	Points
≤ 8meters	1
≤ 4 meters	3
≤ 2 meters	5

All CEP calculations must be accompanied by technical analysis to demonstrate feasibility of achieving those objectives. This must include detailed explanation of designators for both nighttime operations and daytime operations. Daytime operations must include discussion of designation capabilities in grassland, desert, arctic, and urban warfare environments.

Criterion 1B. Assessment of Risk

Based upon the metrics provided by the offeror for Criterion 1A, the Government will perform a technical evaluation of the contractor's proposed approach in accomplishing the objectives of this RFP, and assign a grade of LOW RISK, MEDIUM RISK, or HIGH RISK based on an analysis of the following:

- The effectiveness, design maturity and reliability of the subsystems and components to be used
- Detailed justification and rationale to show how proposed system will achieve performance
- The key technologies used, including their risks, maturity, and industrial base
- The key technical parameters, both those specified and offeror supplied
- The testing done to date and the degree to which it adds confidence to the design and concept
- The systems engineering approach and systems engineering plan for risk reduction
- The testing and evaluation strategy or approach, to include an evaluation of the degree to which it progressively verifies performance and reduces risk

For informational purposes, the following "Risk" definitions are applicable, and will result in adjustment to the scores given for Criterion 1A, as specified below:

"LOW RISK" – proposed metrics are technically sound, substantiated with supportable data, and the Government Evaluation team has a "high level" of confidence that the proposed strategy and approach for accomplishing the objectives of this RFP can be accomplished within the offeror's proposed cost, schedule, and performance parameters.

Criterion 1A Evaluation Adjustment: NONE.

“MEDIUM RISK” – proposed metrics represent a challenging approach to accomplishing the objectives of the RFP, data is not completely supportable or substantiated, and the Government Evaluation team has a “moderate level” of confidence that the proposed strategy and approach will meet the objectives of the RFP within the cost, schedule, and performance parameters proposed by the offeror.

Criterion 1A Evaluation Adjustment: 15 points deducted from Criterion 1A score.

“HIGH RISK” – proposed metrics for accomplishing the objectives of the RFP are extremely questionable, metrics are unsubstantiated and/or unsupported, and the Government Evaluation team has a “low level” of confidence that the objectives of the RFP can be accomplished within the offeror’s proposed cost, schedule, and performance parameters.

Criterion 1A Evaluation Adjustment: 30 points deducted from Criterion 1A score.

Criterion 1 C. Anti-Tampering Device

Baseline Performance:

An anti-tamper device that ensures the classified elements of the fuze guidance package are not accessible in the field and are irretrievable from an expended round, including a dud round.

Extended Performance:

An anti-tamper device that ensures the classified elements of the fuze guidance package are not accessible even through extreme measures in a research environment.

Point Table for Performance of Anti-Tampering Device	
Performance	Points
Baseline	0
Extended	6

Criterion 2: Realistic and Supported Cost-per-Unit Estimated Production Cost

Points will be awarded based on the realistic and supported cost-per-unit estimated production cost, as shown in the table below. The maximum number of points for this criterion is 100 points.

Points	Production Cost (\$)
100	30
90	50
80	100
70	150
60	200
50	300
35	400
20	500

The per unit cost of the fuze/guidance package replacement, assuming an order of 30,000 units, must be below \$500 (GFY04\$). A preliminary cost evaluation, based on the early design and technical parameters, must be included in the RFP. The price construct of Optional Level III Drawings (CLIN 0004) must be consistent with the per-unit-production cost and program efforts.

The cost per unit calculation must address all of the production WBS elements listed as part of the Replacement Fuze Assembly:

- Structure
- Sensors/Seekers
- Guidance Processor

- Control Mechanisms
- Power Source
- Connectors/Cables
- Integration/Assembly, Test, and Checkout

The *pro-rata* portion of the associated Program Management costs, Manufacturing Support costs and Non-Recurring Production Tooling and Test Equipment costs shall also be included as part of the total ODAM cost per unit cost projections. It is also assumed that there are no changes to the existing 60mm mortar launch systems to accommodate the new ODAM capability.

Cost analysis and breakdown to support the cost estimate must accompany the estimation. This includes the projected costs for the Bill of Material (BOM) and Labor (Fabrication, Assembly, Integration & Test) associated with the various WBS elements shown earlier. The Per-unit-production cost estimates for the ODAM replacement Fuze Assembly are to be based on a total production of 30,000 units to be delivered no more than 6 months from date of order.

Criterion 3: Realistic and Supported Program cost

Points will be awarded for the realistic and supported program cost as shown in the Table below. The maximum number of points for this criterion is 100 points.

Points	Program Cost (\$M)
100	5
90	5.5
80	6
70	6.5
60	7
50	8
35	9
20	10

Offerors may bid any total cost they deem realistic that is below the established NTE \$10,000,000 ceiling for CLINs 0001, 0002, 0003, and 0005. As previously stated, the NTE \$10,000,000 ceiling does not include the cost for CLIN 0004. Cost proposals will be evaluated for the reasonableness of costs, and the risk that the development costs associated with the program could escalate to the point that the government funding will not allow completion of the program.

Cost realism for this development effort will be evaluated in the Cost Volume and in concert with the Technical Volume. The objective of this criterion is to assess the risk in the proposed program. The costs must be realistic relative to the scope of the proposed program, and are not to exceed a total ODAM program cost of NTE \$10,000,000 (total Then Year \$) for all of the contractor's Phases I, II, and III (CLINs 0001, 0002, 0003, and 0005 inclusive) efforts. Any use of or leverage from non-DARPA ODAM program funding, such as contractor investments, other related programs, etc. shall be clearly identified.

The contractor must also identify the potential costs associated with the Government's unlimited rights to the ODAM Level II and Level III drawing packages, as stipulated in CLIN 0004.

Criterion 4: Realistic and Supported Program Schedule

Points will be awarded for the realistic and supported program schedule as shown in the Table below. The maximum number of points for this criterion is 100 points.

Points	Program Schedule (Months)
100	24
80	<26

50	<28
20	≤30

The development schedule of 30 months is considered adequate; 24 months is optimal.

Proposers shall provide a detailed Level 3 Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) in support of the proposed Program Schedule. The effort under this solicitation will be divided into three phases. Offerors shall prepare the WBS to support proposals encompassing all three phases.

Phase I – Preliminary and Critical Design with an emphasis on component identification and design. Phase I shall last approximately 6-9 months and will end with a Critical Design Review (CDR). The results of that review and the contractor's performance to that point will be the basis for a decision whether to proceed to Phase II.

Phase II – Brassboard Fabrication and Optimization with an emphasis on detailed design, component qualification (to include simulated launch conditions), hardware-in-the-loop testing, and test plan for full system test and evaluation. This phase is expected to last approximately 12-15 months and will end with a Test Readiness Review (TRR). The results of that review and the contractor's performance to that point will be the basis for a decision whether to proceed to Phase III.

Phase III - Subject to the results of the Phase II CDR, the contractor will be selected to continue into the field test and demonstration. Phase III will focus primarily on the successful testing and demonstrations of the optically designated mortars. Phase III duration will be a minimum of 6 months.

Criterion 5: Management Evaluation

Points will be awarded on the basis of the strength of the management team, the proposed management plan, and the offerors proposed participation of small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business and/or historically black colleges or universities and minority institutions in performance of the contract. The management evaluation will include a review of the submitted program plan, and will be evaluated for the factors given below. The maximum number of points for this criterion is 100 points. The maximum points for each factor are listed previous to the factor.

- [18 points] The experience and qualifications of the top management team
- [18 points] The organization of the team, including clear division of responsibility and authority and lines of communication
- [18 points] Management plan, inclusive of project management, resource management, test management, and security management.
- [18 points] Program risk mitigation plan, inclusive of the soundness of the schedule network including its sensitivity to unexpected delays and the schedule critical path;
- [18 points] The assignment of resources to the appropriate phases of work; and visibility into the progress, costs, and risks in the development.
- [10 points] The extent of participation of small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, small disadvantaged business, women-owned small business and/or historically black colleges or universities and minority institutions in performance of the contract will be evaluated on the basis of the proposed extent of participation of such organizations in terms of the value of the total acquisition and the complexity and variety of the work such organizations are to perform.

Criterion 6: Past Performance

All offerors will be evaluated on the basis of their past performance on government projects of a similar size and scope. The maximum number of points for this criterion is 100 points.

On the basis of the Offeror's Past Performance composite rating, described below in this section, the points scored in this criterion are

Points	Past Performance Rating
100	Excellent
60	Good

20	Neutral
0	Poor

Past Performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror, as an organization, has satisfied its customers in recent works, and complied with Federal, State and Local laws and regulations. The offeror shall provide a list of people capable of evaluating the Offeror's past performance during the past three (3) years in the following areas:

Performers will be evaluated on the basis of:

- The quality and timeliness of the offeror's work;
- The reasonableness of its prices, costs and claims;
- The reasonableness of its business behavior/practices - its willingness to cooperate and helpfulness in solving problems;
- The Offeror's concern for the interests of its customers;
- The Offeror's ability to comply with Small Business Subcontracting requirements pursuant to FAR 52.219-8 and 52.219-9; and
- The Offeror's integrity.

These past performance areas are of equal value for purposes of this evaluation. The Past Performance Questionnaire to be used for surveying Offeror's past performance is provided at Attachment 3. If the reference is a Government Contracting Organization, and has previously collected past performance information on the identified contract pursuant to FAR Subpart 42.15, the format used to collect the information may be used instead of the attached Past Performance Questionnaire.

The offeror will provide the list of references/evaluators as part of their proposal using the Past Performance Questionnaire found at Attachment 3. The completed Past Performance Questionnaire must include the names of at least two (2), but not more than five (5) Past Performance contacts. Offerors who cannot provide at least two (2) references will explain why in their proposal. Offerors will complete the cover sheet of the Past Performance Questionnaire, provided as Attachment 3, and for each reference/evaluator listed, send the entire Past Performance Questionnaire to the reference. The offeror shall request the reference(s) to complete the Past Performance Questionnaire and return it no later than 21 calendar days after the issuance date of this solicitation. This means that the offeror should provide the Past Performance Questionnaire to the reference(s)/evaluator(s) selected as soon as possible after release of this solicitation. All Past Performance Questionnaires shall be sent to the attention of the DARPA Contracting Officer, Anthony E. Cicala. Failure of the reference(s)/evaluator(s) to return the completed Past Performance Questionnaire to the DARPA Contracting Officer within the requested timeframe herein, will increase the likelihood that the Government will evaluate the offeror's past performance as "Neutral" and so consider that evaluation in the terms of the Government's best-value award decision.

Nothing herein shall prejudice the government's right to search other records, including the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), and other such Past Performance collection databases, and/or to initiate contact with others that may be cognizant of the offerors past performance.

CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT

52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)